DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 125 044 EA 008 338

AUTHOR Deever, R. Merwin; Berg, George E.
TITLE The Status of Teacher Evaluation Practices in Arizona and a Proposed Model. Research Reports on Educational Administration, Vol. 6, No. 2.
INSTITUTION Arizona State Univ., Tempe. Bureau of Educational Research and Services.
PUB DATE Nov 75
NOTE 10p.; Summary of a Doctoral Dissertation by Barbara Irene Davis

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Administration; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Methods; Personnel Evaluation; Personnel Policy; *School Surveys; *State Surveys; *Teacher Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS *Arizona

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes a doctoral dissertation that investigated the status of teacher evaluation practices in Arizona as of October 1974. Data were gathered through questionnaires mailed to the principal or chief administrator of all 774 public schools in Arizona. Respondents were asked to indicate the purpose, criteria, and frequency of teacher evaluation in their school, as well as the specific evaluation methods used. Analysis of the data showed that 78.9% of the responding schools conducted formal teacher evaluation; of those schools conducting formal evaluation, 73.5% did so for formally stated purposes, and 82.9% based their evaluation on written criteria. The most frequent purposes indicated for teacher evaluation were improvement of instruction (56.1%) and facilitation of administrative decisions (45.1%). The most common evaluation criteria was discipline or classroom control (54.9%). Teachers were informed of the results of their evaluation in 91.6% of the schools conducting formal evaluation. (Author/JG)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED125044

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

RESEARCH REPORTS ON EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

Volume VI, Number 2

November 1975

THE STATUS OF TEACHER EVALUATION PRACTICES IN ARIZONA AND A PROPOSED MODEL

A Summary of a Doctoral Dissertation by Barbara Irene Davis

Prepared by

R. Merwin Deever

and

George E. Berg

Published by

BUREAU OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND SERVICES
R. Merwin Deever, Director
College of Education
Arizona State University
Tempe, Arizona 85281

EA 008 338

FOREWORD

With the assistance of Arizona School Administrators, Inc., the Bureau of Educational Research and Services of Arizona State University identifies dissertations produced in the Department of Educational Administration and Supervision whose topics are of greatest current interest to school administrators in Arizona.

The disserations identified are then summarized in Research Reports on Educational Administration and distributed to school administrators and A.S.U. faculty in the Department of Educational Administration. The current issue is the twenty-seventh in the series.

The investigation by Dr. Barbara Irene Davis concerned itself with the status of teacher evaluation practices in the state of Arizona as of October 1974. A model for teacher evaluation based on this investigation was also recommended.

Other dissertations which have been summarized and published in the past are listed on the inside back cover. All dissertations from which the summaries are derived are available on interlibrary loan and may be obtained by any library upon application to the Director of Libraries, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 85281. All dissertations are also available on microfilm from University Microfilm, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan.

M.D.
G.E.B.

THE STATUS OF TEACHER EVALUATION PRACTICES IN ARIZONA AND A PROPOSED MODEL

INTRODUCTION

The need for reliable and valid teacher evaluation in public schools is recognized in today's literature (Redfern, 1973; McNeil, 1971' N.E.A., 1964, 1969; Jones, 1972). These authors present a picture of widespread dissatisfaction with the existing procedures. Terms such as "haphazzard", "shocking" and "low credibility of the process" are frequently mentioned regarding teacher evaluation practices.

And yet, administrators, even in view of the difficulties presented by teacher evaluation practices, are now faced with pressures from the public for accountability of teacher effectiveness, and also pressure from teachers for defensible teacher evaluation practices.

This study sought an analysis of the status of teacher evaluation practices from all the principals in the state of Arizona. This comprehensive view of evaluation practices enables administrators to compare, evaluate and recommend improvements for their local teacher evaluation programs. This research can also benefit professional education organizations as they consider their role in teacher evaluation and in setting standards for their own members.

THE PROBLEM

The problem of this study was to describe the status of teacher evaluation as practiced in Arizona public schools in the 1973-74 school year with regard to purposes, criteria, evaluations, frequency and methods and procedures, and to recommend a model for teacher evaluation based on the investigation.

PROCEDURE

The descriptive survey research design was employed in this study. During the 1973-74 school year all of the principals listed in the Arizona Education Directory for that year were contacted. For schools not having a principal the head teacher was contacted and where there was neither principal or head teacher, the superintendent was sent the survey instrument. This was an N of 774 public schools which was stratified by classification (elementary, secondary) and size.

The instrument to determine the status of teacher evaluation was divided into eight sections. These sections were: demographics, purpose, criteria, frequency of evaluation, approaches, checklist of ten methods and procedures, request for copy of forms used in the local district, and whether or not the respondent wished to receive a copy of the results.

FINDINGS

1. The questionnaire was sent to 774 public schools in the state of Arizona. A total of 621 (80.2%) replied, and of those responding, 490 (78.9%) schools conducted formal teacher evaluation.

2. The purposes most frequently indicated for the evaluation of teachers were the improvement of instruction (56.1%) and the facilitation of administrative decisions (including rehiring, tenure, placement, etc.) (45.1%).

3. The principals of 360 schools (73.5%) conducting formal teacher evaluation indicated that the purposes of the evaluation were written in school board policy or in administrative directives.

4. The principals of 406 (82.9%) of the schools in which formal teacher evaluation was conducted indicated that they had written criteria upon which teachers were evaluated.

5. The most frequent response to the question of who had determined the criteria was "administration" (not specified) (39.6%).

6. The criterion of teacher evaluation used in more schools than any other was discipline or classroom control (54.9%).

7. The most common frequency for teacher evaluation was twice a year for probationary teachers and once a year for tenure teachers.

8. The principal conducted teacher evaluation alone in 50.0% of the schools conducting formal teacher evaluation, and in 25.1% of these schools the principal conducted teacher evaluation in conjunction with someone else.

9. The presage (teacher characteristics) approach to teacher evaluation was used in 63.1% of the schools and the process (teacher performance) approach in 95.7%.

10. The three evaluation methods checked most frequently were: conference/interview (91.8%), informal classroom observation (89.0%), and formal classroom observation (87.8%).

11. Teachers were informed in advance of a classroom visitation in 56.3% of the schools conducting formal teacher evaluation, and in 91.6% teachers were informed of the results of an evaluation.

CONCLUSIONS

Considering these findings the following conclusions were made:

1. Many public schools in Arizona do not conduct formal teacher evaluation. Tenure teachers are evaluated less often than probationary teachers and in some schools are not evaluated at all.

2. In some schools the purpose or the criteria for teacher evaluation or both are unknown to evaluator and/or teacher. It is not clear what purpose is served in such cases.

3. Some schools have no stated criteria at all for evaluating teachers. Many of the criteria used in schools call for subjective judgements on the part of the evaluator and are of questionable validity.

4. Some methods require subjective judgement on the part of the evaluator and do not necessarily relate to stated criteria and purpose of teacher evaluation.

5. Principals as a group are concerned about teacher evaluation and want to help in improving their teacher evaluation practice. Inasmuch as principals are most likely to be doing the evaluating, they need expertise in the evaluation of teacher competence.

6. Although improvement of instruction is a major purpose of teacher evaluation, some teachers are not informed of the results of their evaluation.

7. Current teacher evaluation practices in the state of Arizona do not conform to the legal requirements (HB 2064) which have been established and must be met by all Arizona public school districts by June 30, 1977.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations were made as a result of the study:

1. All schools, regardless of size, should conduct formal teacher evaluation. Evaluation for the purpose of improving instruction should be continuous. In order to comply with state requirements (HB 2064) evaluation to facilitate administrative decisions should be conducted at least twice each year for probationary teachers and at least every other year for tenure teachers.

2. Purposes for teacher evaluation should be agreed upon in advance by all persons concerned, teachers and principals, as well as anyone else responsible for or involved in teacher evaluation. Criteria, once agreed upon, should be stated in official written school district policy and made available to all persons concerned with teacher evaluation.

3. Criteria, to be valid, should be derived from the role description of the teacher as supported by research and mutually agreed upon by evaluator and teacher as being directly related to the purpose of teacher evaluation. Subjective rating scales should be replaced by the stating of specific criteria leading to the improvement of instruction.

4. Methods and procedures, mutually agreed upon, should lead to valid and reliable conclusions concerning the competence of the teacher and should be conducive to the improvement of instruction.

5. Resources and specialized training in the improvement of teacher evaluation practices and the improvement of instruction should be made available to all Arizona public school principals.

6. A school district policy should be adopted assuring that teachers will be informed of the results of every evaluation within a certain time limit.

7. The model for teacher evaluation, as described in the dissertation, is recommended for each Arizona public school district.

IMPLICATIONS

Since improvement of instruction is a major concern of formal teacher evaluation, there is a need to have within each public school district, a set of well defined criteria and procedures, consistent with the philosophy and goals of the district, for the formal evaluation of classroom teachers. These criteria and procedures should be mutually developed by teachers, principals and those involved with teacher evaluation and written as school policy. Steps then need to be developed to maintain communication with all concerned about the procedures and to train the evaluators in the evaluation of teacher competence.

The implementation of House Bill 2064 is set for June 30, 1977. It behooves all public school districts in Arizona to be diligent in their efforts to develop an effective set of guidelines and procedures for teacher evaluation.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Browder, Lesley H., Jr. An Administrator's Handbook on Educational Accountability. Prepared for AASA National Academy for School Executives. Arlington, Virginia: American Association of School Administrators, 1973.

Commission on Public School Personnel Policies in Ohio. Teacher Evaluation to Improve Learning. The Fourth Report of the Commission on Public School Personnel Policies in Ohio (ERIC, ED 076504), 60.

Demeke, Howard J. Guidelines for Evaluation: The School Principal. Department of Educational Administration and Supervision, Arizona State University.

_____. Guidelines for Evaluation: The School Administrator--Seven Areas of Competence. Department of Educational Administration and Supervision, Arizona State University, 1972.

Feldman, Donald J. and Jere E. Brophy. "Measuring Teacher Effects on Pupil Achievement." Paper presented at a Symposium of Annual Meeting of American Educational Research Association, February 25-March 1, 1973, New Orleans, Louisiana.

Frison, L. S. "Evaluating Teacher Performance--How to Get Beyond the Checklist." Paper presented at National Association of Secondary School Principals Annual Convention (56th), March 20, 1972, Anaheim, California.

Kowilsky, Marilyn, John McNeil and George Flannigan. "The Psychological Effects of Teacher Evaluation by Results," Phi Delta Kappan, January, 1974, 348-349.

McFadden, Dennis N. "Increasing the Effectiveness of Educational Management-Project D: Appraising Teacher Performance." Columbus, Ohio: School Management Institute and Bottelle Memorial Institute, April, 1970, 186.

Musella, Donald. "Improving Teacher Evaluation," The Journal of Teacher Education, XXI, 1 (1970), 15-21.

National IOTA Council. The Role of the Teacher in Society: Six Areas of Teacher Competence. San Jose, California and Tempe, Arizona: National IOTA Council, 1970.

National School Boards Association. School Board Policies on Teacher Evaluation. Educational Policies Development Kit. Evanston, Illinois, October, 1971, 32.

Rabinowitz, William and Robert M. W. Travers. "Problems of Defining and Assessing Teacher Effectiveness," Educational Theory, III, 2 (1953), 212-219.

Soadeh, Abrahim Q. "Teacher Effectiveness or Classroom Efficiency: A New Direction in the Evaluation of Teaching," The Journal of Teacher Education, XXI, 1 (1970), 73-91.

Speicher, Dean. Can Teacher Evaluation be Made More Meaningful? Paper presented to AASA at annual meeting, New Jersey, February, 1972.

VanderWerf, Lester S. How to Evaluate Teachers and Teaching. New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1958.